

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Michael Whitmarsh et al.

Serial No.: 09/710, 287

Filed: November 10, 2000

Docket No.: 10003977-1

Title: PRINT PROCESSING SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH DOCUMENT ADVISOR SERVICE**REMARKS**

The following Remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed June 10, 2005, in which claims 1-39 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 4, 23, and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19, 25, 26, 27, and 28 have been amended to clarify Applicant's invention. Claims 1-3, 5-22, and 25-39, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevcik et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,330,542 in view of Nakatsuyama U.S. Patent No. 5,875,441.

With this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 19 have each been amended to clarify that the print job is defined by a data file for the print job and a print request identifying at least one attribute of the print job as specified by the customer. In addition, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method includes presenting the at least one document type for the print job to the customer via the network communication link, and receiving the print request for the print job at the print processing system controller via the network communication link, with the print request specifying a document type for the print job from the at least one document type for the print job and identifying the at least one attribute of the print job as specified by the customer. In addition, independent claim 19 has been amended to clarify that the print processing system controller is adapted to present the at least one document type for the print job to the customer, and receive the print request for the print job from the customer, wherein the print request specifies a document type for the print job from the at least one document type for the print job and identifies the at least one attribute of the print job as specified by the customer.

With respect to the Sevcik et al. and Nakatsuyama patents, neither of these patents, individually or in combination, teach or suggest a method of processing a print job of a customer before submitting the print job to at least one of a plurality of print providers, as claimed in independent claim 1, nor a system for processing a print job of a customer before submitting the print job to at least one of a plurality of print providers, as claimed in independent claim 19. For example, the system of the Nakatsuyama patent retrieves specific document types that can generate a document satisfying a query 3a as designed by the user,

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Michael Whitmarsh et al.

Serial No.: 09/710,287

Filed: November 10, 2000

Docket No.: 10003977-1

Title: PRINT PROCESSING SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH DOCUMENT ADVISOR SERVICE

wherein the query is a condition that documents to be retrieved should satisfy and includes a designation such as an element type of an element in a document, a connection relationship between the elements, and a string that is included in a text in an element (col. 6, lines 47-59). The system of the Nakatsuyama patent, however, does not determine a document type for the print job based on characteristics of the print job as included in a data file for the print job, wherein the data file for the print job is distinguished from a print request identifying at least one attribute of the print job as specified by the customer.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 19 are each patentably distinct from the Sevcik et al. and Nakatsuyama patents and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, as dependent claims 2-3 and 5-18 further define patentably distinct claim 1, and dependent claims 20-22 and 25-39 further define patentably distinct claim 19, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are also in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claims 1-3, 5-22, and 25-39 be allowed.

SEP 07 2005

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Michael Whitmarsh et al.

Serial No.: 09/710, 287

Filed: November 10, 2000

Docket No.: 10003977-1

Title: PRINT PROCESSING SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH DOCUMENT ADVISOR SERVICE**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-3, 5-22, and 25-39 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Whitmarsh et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: SEPT. 7, 2005
SAL:jan


Scott A. Lund
Reg. No. 41,166

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 7TH day of September, 2005.

By 
Name: Scott A. Lund